

# **HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM MEETING MINUTES**

**February 23, 2012**

These minutes summarize the meeting of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS) Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) held on February 23, 2012 at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in San Francisco, California. Participants in the meeting included the BCT, which is made up of representatives from the U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board). The City of San Francisco (City), their consultants, the Lennar team of developers, and Navy consultants also attended the meeting. These minutes describe the key points, decisions, and action items agreed to at the meeting. A list of attendees is included as Attachment A. The document review table is included as Attachment B. Action items from the meeting are included as Attachment C.

## **1.0 Navy Business/Action Items (Keith Forman, Navy)**

Keith Forman (Navy) began the meeting with introductions. Craig Cooper (USEPA) and Ryan Miya (DTSC) were present to represent the regulatory agencies involved on the project.

Action Items from the previous meeting:

- DTSC will schedule a teleconference between the Navy and the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) to discuss CDPH comments on the Revised Risk & Dose Modeling report. *Complete. Teleconference and the Navy was held prior to the BCT meeting.*
- The Navy will hold internal discussions on how to handle negative numbers in the radiological concentrations at Parcel F. *Complete. The Navy will use the minimum detectable activity (MDA) when doing dose and risk modeling calculations.*
- Navy will discuss Submarine Pens and Dry Docks 5 through 7 with Laurie Lowman (Navy) to see why they have historically been included on maps showing them as radiologically impacted when they were not identified in the Historic Radiological Assessment Report. *In Progress. Mr. Forman will continue to follow up with Ms. Lowman to see what needs to be included in the radiological screening activities.*

## **2.0 Parcel C Pre-Characterization Update (Bob Hunt, Navy)**

Mr. Hunt gave an overview of remedial unit (RU)-C2 which includes Buildings 258 and 251 and two volatile organic compound (VOC) groundwater plumes. The primary groundwater contaminants of concern include trichloroethylene (TCE), tetrachloroethylene (PCE), and chlorobenzenes. The purpose of the pre-design investigation is to collect soil and groundwater samples to characterize the groundwater plume and help to define the area warranting soil vapor extraction (SVE).

Currently the Navy has installed 15 temporary vapor probes and collected soil samples from 2 to 5 feet below ground surface (bgs). They are anticipating collecting the 15 vapor samples and

submitting them for analysis within the following week. In the Building 251 VOC plume area, the Navy has completed six Tier I hydropunches and two Tier II step-out hydropunches and collected soil and groundwater samples for laboratory analysis. They still need to complete the sample analysis for the Tier II samples and bio-indicator analysis at five locations. Mr. Hunt presented the results of the soil and groundwater sampling. The Navy found that sample DP-7-20 was the hotspot location near the center of the plume, but these same concentrations are not found in the downgradient sample locations.

At the Building 258 VOC plume remediation area, four proposed sample locations encountered bedrock in the borings at 3 feet bgs. The borings that were advanced and encountered refusal were intended to better define VOC concentrations collected from a groundwater monitoring well (IR28MW188F) that was installed within the bedrock. Potential ways to still collect the samples from the area include using an air rotary drill rig to penetrate the bedrock; however, this option is limited in the downgradient direction by open trenches in the area. The other option is to replace the four refused soil boring locations with soil vapor points. Mr. Miya noted that soil vapor points would only collect soil vapor data to a depth of 3 feet bgs and that the sample points are surrounded by open trenches. In addition, at some point the Navy will still need to collect soil data in this area. Currently the feasibility of using in-situ bioremediation in this area is very limited. Ms. Karla Brasaemle (Tech Law Inc.) asked about putting biosubstrates in the bottom of the open trenches prior to backfilling the trenches. Mr. Mehrdad Javaherian (Alliance) noted that the trenches are only 8 feet deep and the impacted zone in the area starts at 8 feet deep. Ms. Brasaemle noted that if they applied dense non-aqueous phase liquids (DNAPL) as a biosubstrate in the trenches then it might be able to permeate the subsurface through fractures. This would be contingent on whether there are fractures at the surface of the bedrock. Mr. Javaherian noted that they don't know the depth at which groundwater is entering that monitoring well, and the application of the substrate would be limited to the areas where the trenches are located, which is along a portion of the south side of the groundwater plume. The soil vapor samples might give a good idea of where the impacted groundwater is located. Mr. Cooper noted that the Record of Decision (ROD) required bio-remediation of the groundwater in this location and if that option is not feasible then it will require a change to the ROD. By putting the biosubstrate in the open trenches, that the Navy would meet the requirements of the ROD but the bioremediation might not work at this location. Mr. Javaherian noted that it would be hard to judge the effectiveness of the bioremediation since the only sample point is the monitoring well which is not near the open trenches.

Ms. Brasaemle wondered where the source of contamination in the groundwater originated from. Mr. Javaherian noted that the nearby buildings used to do paint stripping and had dip tanks. Mr. Javaherian also noted that unless the fractures within the bedrock are interconnected, the size of the groundwater plume would be difficult to evaluate using soil vapor sampling. Mr. Cooper noted that even if soil vapor data were limited in the area, they would still be valuable for calculating risk at the site. Mr. Miya noted that additional data collected during the Parcel C soil gas sampling event could also be used to better characterize the site and site risk. Mr. Javaherian added that they could keep these soil gas survey points and reuse them during the Parcel C soil gas sampling event. Ms. Kito noted that the Parcel C soil gas survey won't be conducted until all the remediation is complete on the Parcel. Ms. Brasaemle noted that if they do soil gas sampling at the site now, the Navy is going to want to come back at a later date and collect more samples because of the open trenches in the area. Mr. Miya noted that whatever path is decided at the site, it would need to be backed up by all available data to support the decision. Ms. Kito noted that

they could put a land use control for depths below the point that they were able to collect soil gas samples.

Mr. Javaherian noted that at the Building 251 plume the chemical concentrations are below levels typically treated by zero-valent iron which is the proposed remedy at this site. This site might be a better candidate for bioremediation and this should be considered prior to implementation of the remedy.

Mr. Hunt noted that the pre-design investigation technical memorandum will be sent to the agencies in March or April 2012. The pre-design investigation at RU-C1, C4, and C5 is being conducted in February through March 2012, with the technical memorandum to follow in April 2012. The remedial design for Parcel C will be issued in June, followed by the remedial action work plan in September and the remedial action in December 2012. Mr. Miya noted that he would like to revisit this issue at next month's BCT meeting.

### **3.0 Radiological Update (Chris Yantos, Navy)**

Mr. Yantos began the radiological program update and summarized the Crisp Road/Parcel E sanitary sewer and storm drain removals and building surveys. Mr. Yantos said that the CDPH conducted confirmation sampling on October 25, 2011 at Buildings 414, 701, and 704, and they are currently waiting on a free release from CDPH. The Final Status Survey (FSS) for Sites IR-04 and 807 was submitted on February 10, 2012 and CDPH is requesting confirmation samples. The Final UC-3 Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR) will be issued in February 2012.

Mr. Forman asked Mr. Jeff Wong of CDPH for a recommendation on how the Navy can move forward with so many sites currently on hold pending CDPH review of documents, issuance of free release letters, or collection of confirmation samples. Mr. Wong indicated that he can't make a recommendation on the subject. Mr. Forman asked Mr. Wong to take back the message to CDPH that the Navy is unhappy with the CDPH document review cycle and unresponsiveness. Mr. Forman noted that CDPH is violating some of the tenets of the cost reimbursable contract between the CDPH and the Navy that would make it easy for the federal government to stop signing invoices for CDPH. He would like this elevated to senior management within CDPH because the Navy is tired of dealing with an agency that is dysfunctional, nonproductive, and difficult to deal with. Mr. Wong said he will make it his responsibility to alert senior management at CDPH to the issues raised during this BCT. Mr. Forman noted that these delays created by CDPH imperil the entire environmental cleanup program at HPNS. Ms. Kito noted that any delays to the project schedule affect the budget at HPNS. There is zero value to delays in the schedule that the Navy has to pay for. The Navy can no longer afford the basewide radiological support so that program will have to be downsized.

The sanitary sewer and storm drain removal began in Parcel C on January 4, 2011. To date, 21,551 linear feet of sanitary sewer and storm drain lines have been removed, which is about 60 percent of the project. The Navy has excavated 35,967 cubic yards of materials and restored/repaved 13 of 34 active survey units.

Mr. Yantos summarized the Parcel C building surveys. The Final FSS report for Building 214 was submitted on November 2, 2011. CDPH has said that they don't want to do confirmation sampling at Building 241. The Final FSS report and responses to comments (RTCs) for Building 271 is currently under Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO) review. Surveys at the North

Pier are ongoing and the scan survey is complete. The Final FSS and RTCs at Buildings 272, 203, and 241 are in process and the Navy is waiting on CDPH comments.

The Task-Specific Plans (TSPs) for the Building Sites 500 Series area are complete. At Building 503, the Navy has completed the survey of 7,400 cubic yards of material. At Building 500, the survey and sanitary sewer and storm drain line removal is complete. The scanning and sampling activities are complete at Buildings 509, 510/510A, 521, and 529. Scanning and sampling are underway at the 500 Series Area and at Buildings 506, 517, 520, and the former Shacks 79/80. The Navy is continuing to remove asphalt from the Building 507 site.

The Navy is continuing the removal of the storm drain and sanitary sewer lines in the Building 500 Series Area. The Navy has excavated 9,132 linear feet of storm drain/sanitary sewer lines and approximately 19,500 cubic yards of soil. Five of the 15 active survey units have been restored.

Mr. Yantos noted that at the Gun Mole Pier they have sampled 74 of 74 survey units, and 53 survey units data are below project release criteria. The Navy is currently remediating four impacted survey units which are focused around the former Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory barge location. The Navy found a commodity at survey unit 40. The commodity was removed and remediated. There will be additional investigation at survey unit 11 for a high gamma reading. The Navy is crushing 17,600 net tons of non-impacted asphalt onsite. The Navy is currently developing a plan for survey of the concrete foundations and other structures.

In Parcel D-1, the Navy is currently working on the south pier area and has completed survey and sampling at 14 of 14 survey units. They are developing a plan for survey of concrete foundation and other structures in the area. The Navy is developing an Internal Draft FSS report for sanitary sewer and storm drain removals from beneath Building 274. The Building 383 area survey is complete and so far there have been no detections above the action levels. The Navy is planning on removing the remaining footer foundation, surveying and sampling in this area.

The Navy has completed remediation of the cesium-137 and radium-226 impacted survey units around the Building 313, 313A, and 322 sites and is developing an Internal Draft FSS. The storm drain and sanitary sewer removal at Parcel D-1 is 99 percent complete. The Navy is currently remediating two survey units. Construction of the drainage swale along Manseau Street was completed in December 2011. The Navy is currently preparing three draft survey unit project report packages for submittal to the regulatory agencies in February and March 2012.

The Navy is awaiting review and concurrence from the CDPH on the B-140 Technical Memorandum and FSS. The Draft Parcel B RACR was submitted to the regulatory agencies on October 20, 2011, and they just received a letter from CDPH indicating that they had no further comments. Mr. Forman noted that the free release letter and acceptance of the Building 140 Technical Memorandum are the only things holding up completion of the radiological work in Parcel B. Ms. Kito noted that all the invoices from CDPH for the past six months state that they have been working on Building 140 but they haven't received comments or concurrence on that report yet. Mr. Forman noted that senior management from CDPH said that they should have a letter for Building 140 by January 20, 2011, which they never received. The Final Parcel G RACR with RTCs was issued on December 2, 2011. The Navy has received DTSC concurrence and is awaiting a free release letter from USEPA and CDPH. The Final Parcel UC-3

Radiological RACR with RTCs will be issued in February 2012. In addition, the Navy is currently waiting on a free release letter from CDPH at Parcel D-2.

Mr. Yantos noted that the second version of the Draft Radiological Risk and Dose Modeling for IR Sites 7/18 was submitted on September 12, 2011, and the Navy is currently responding to agency comments. No additional sampling was requested by the CDPH. The Navy along with CDPH, DTSC, and the City of San Francisco held a conference call on February 9, 2012 to discuss comments received by CDPH. The Navy confirmed that no additional sampling is required at this time as long as the language in the report was improved to summarize all data, history, and information known about the site. Mr. Yantos noted that this will be revision three to the report. Mr. Forman added that there is no budget to revise documents three times and the Navy will need to work very closely with CDPH to make this the final revision.

#### **4.0 TCRA for the Experimental Ship Shielding Range**

Ms. Urizar presented an overview on the time-critical removal action (TCRA) for the experimental ship shielding range. This area was identified in the Historical Radiological Assessment report prepared for HPNS as the “experimental shielding range” or the “south gate range.” This area is now an open field and the radiological driver for the investigation is cobalt-60. Other radiological contaminants of concern in the area include cesium-137, radium-226, and strontium-90. Mr. Miya asked if this was the only area in Parcel E-2 where cobalt-60 was the main concern and Ms. Urizar confirmed that it is. It is believed that this range operated from the late 1950s to the early 1960s. The site historically consisted of a soil berm along the western side of the range and one area identified as the instrumentation area. Historic documentation indicates that cobalt-60 gamma rays were focused towards shielding material located in or near the San Francisco Bay. Some documentation implies that the gamma rays were focused using PVC pipe. Mr. Forman noted that since this was an experimental area of the base, many of the historical records concerning the activities in this area are likely still classified. Ms. Urizar noted that the half life of cobalt-60 is approximately 5.2 years, so it has been between nine and ten half-lives since the radiological contamination occurred and there might not be any cobalt-60 remaining in this area.

The work planned for this area includes a pre-characterization of the berm and fan-shaped area for waste profiling purposes. The Navy will conduct gamma walk-over surveys to identify discrete radiological sources in the area and then excavate the berm and fan-shaped area in one-foot lifts in between the gamma walk-over surveys. They are planning on removing approximately 3,200 cubic yards of soil which will be radiologically screened. Since this area is in Parcel E-2, they will have construction oversight in case munitions are discovered. The excavated soil will be used on the existing polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hot spot screening pads. If screened soil meets radiological release criteria and HPNS backfill criteria then it will be returned to the site and used as backfill. The Navy will conduct a final condition survey for the range footprint and buffer area since this area is not going for free release. All radiological samples will be analyzed at the HPNS onsite laboratory and samples will not be sent to an offsite laboratory since the Navy is not pursuing free release at this location. If strontium is discovered onsite then it will be sent to an offsite laboratory, but strontium is not expected here and is not the driver at the site.

Ms. Urizar noted that comments for the TCRA Action Memorandum have been received from all agencies except CDPH. General categories of the agency comments include a request for

supplemental information regarding site characteristics. Other general comments included improving the organization of previous investigations and actions and how the investigations they related to the TCRA. In addition, the agencies requested that the Navy include all radiological release criteria in the action memorandum, not just cobalt-60. The agencies would like to know how this TCRA will contribute to the Parcel E-2 ROD. In addition, they are requesting further clarification regarding the step-out sampling rules and plan for addressing potential residual contamination. The agencies have also asked how the Navy will prevent releases to the San Francisco Bay. Ms. Urizar noted that there will not be any release to the San Francisco Bay. The Navy is also considering using a revised cobalt-60 release criterion and revising the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs).

An overview of general comments included comments from USEPA and DTSC requesting additional site characterization information. Ms. Urizar responded that the Navy will provide this information. DTSC requested additional details regarding instrumentation and range areas at the site. Ms. Urizar reiterated that the Navy has very little background information for this site and they will include all this information and possibly include as an attachment to the report. The USEPA submitted a comment regarding the type of tubing used in the instrumentation, drainage gradient at the site, and the location of the operations instrumentation. The Navy will include the information that they have in the report but again there isn't much historical information for the site. USEPA and DTSC submitted comments regarding previous investigations in this area. The Navy will put additional information in the report concerning the historical investigations in the area. The USEPA and Water Board submitted comments concerning the release criteria for radionuclides of concern that might be found at the site. The Navy will include release criteria for all radionuclides of concern in the report.

The USEPA and Water Board submitted comments concerning the relationship of this investigation to the Parcel E-2 ROD. Ms. Urizar noted that this TCRA is to remove levels of cobalt-60 above the release criteria within the area of the ship shielding range. If other radionuclides are encountered, they will also be removed but the excavation limits will not be expanded to chase these other radionuclides. Following completion of the field work, a final condition survey will be prepared and will be consistent with the guidelines used to develop the FFS documents at HPNS. The final condition survey will be prepared as part of the RACR and will document "as-left" conditions which will need to be taken into account during the remedial action at Parcel E-2. Additional removal of radionuclides of concern may be warranted for wetland construction in the area and will be accomplished during the remedial action for Parcel E-2. The USEPA, DTSC and Water Board submitted comments concerning residual contamination that might remain following the investigation at the ship shielding range.

Ms. Kito noted that the basewide radiological action memorandum prepared in 2006 covered all of HPNS and originally the ship shielding area was included as part of the Historical Radiological Assessment report. This site is being remediated under a TCRA because it's not following the free-release criteria established in the basewide radiological action memorandum. It didn't make sense for the Navy to follow the free-release protocol for one small area in Parcel E-2 when the entire parcel would need to be evaluated for free-release at a later time. Mr. Forman added that since this site isn't following the basewide radiological action memorandum for free-release, the Navy's attorneys required that this site be investigated as a TCRA and results issued as a stand-alone document.

DTSC and the Water Board had questions concerning how the Navy will protect the San Francisco Bay during construction activities. The Navy will use silt fences, sandbags, straw bales, and other similar best management practices during the field effort. The excavation will not be conducted in the intertidal area and the soil will be screened and processed in the upland areas of Parcels E and E-2.

The Navy would like to revise the cobalt-60 release criterion. Currently the criterion is 0.0361 average picocuries per gram (pCi/g). The laboratory minimum detectable concentration is around 0.03 pCi/g, which leaves little room for error when reporting detected concentrations at the site. The action memorandum proposed using a release criterion of 2.3 pCi/g, but after input from USEPA and DTSC, the Navy has revised the new release criterion to be 0.252 pCi/g, which corresponds to a risk of  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  and a dose of 1.67 millirems/year. By using a release criterion of 0.252 pCi/g, the lab minimum detectable concentration of 0.03 pCi/g would be closer to the goal of  $1/10^{\text{th}}$  of the release criterion and would result in a greater confidence in the sample results. Mr. Miya noted that from a risk perspective, they are still calculating risk for a residential scenario. The revised action memorandum will be issued in the next month as final rather than draft final.

Ms. Kito noted that the Navy is no longer going to have the onsite radiological laboratory at HPNS. Currently, they will have it for this work but if there are any delays to the schedule, the Navy will need to work closely with the regulatory agencies to resolve those issues so that data collected during this investigation can be analyzed onsite. The radiological laboratory will be onsite through 2012.

## **5.0 Transfer Schedule Update (Melanie Kito, Navy)**

Ms. Kito noted that there are two delays this month: one is the Parcel B radiological RACR and this is because the Navy has not received comments from CDPH on Building 140. In Parcel C, the remedial design has been delayed due to investigations currently ongoing in the field. She added that the Parcel E feasibility study does not have a firm date.

## **6.0 Community Involvement Update (Matt Robinson, CirclePoint)**

Mr. Robinson (CirclePoint) noted they have completed collateral materials to enhance materials with the public. The Navy held a community meeting on February 22, 2012 at the Bayview YMCA and presented to existing community groups in Bayview. The Navy is also working on different strategies to increase outreach opportunities with the Latino and Asian communities in Bayview. The Community Events calendar was distributed at the community meeting and distributed through email, community boards, and the HPNS website. The Quarterly Progress Report was also distributed at the community meeting and the HPNS Annual Factsheet is undergoing review and will be distributed in early March. The community meeting had approximately 20 community members in attendance and had three open house tables where the public could get additional information about HPNS activities. They advertised the meeting via the information line in three languages, sent out a meeting announcement to the email list, placed an ad in local newspapers, and flyers were distributed by YCAT.

Mr. Forman presented a cleanup update to the Morgan Heights Homeowners Association on February 13, 2012, and the Navy was joined by Mr. Cooper from USEPA to give an update on the Yosemite Slough project. The Navy met with the Tabernacle on February 14, 2012 and had

good discussions with the group about how to enhance communications with community members in the area. In an effort to reach more Latinos and Asian-Americans in the community, the Navy is consulting with Mr. Carlos Quiroz and Mr. Len Fong. Both consultants have experience working in the Latino and Asian-American communities in San Francisco.

The next community meeting is set for April 11, 2012 at the Alex Pitcher Room in the Southeast Community Facility and the meeting topic will be the Parcel E-2 ROD. The Navy is planning to meet again with the Tabernacle churches once they decide on a date. In addition, the Navy is looking into doing additional radio shows to reach the community.

## **7.0 Action Items/Future Meetings (Melanie Kito, Navy)**

- The Navy will schedule a conference call with the regulatory agencies concerning the proposed path forward at RU-C2.
- The next BCT meeting will be held on March 29, 2012 in San Diego, California. Action items are included as Attachment C.



## ATTACHMENT A

### HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEET

Topic: BCT Meeting  
 Location: Hunters Point Naval Shipyard  
 Tetra Tech Field Trailer  
 San Francisco, CA  
 Date/Time: February 23, 2012 / 10:40 a.m.

Organization	Name	Phone Number	E-Mail Address	Present
Navy	Keith Forman	619-532-0913	keith.s.forman@navy.mil	X
	Melanie Kito	619-532-0787	melanie.kito@navy.mil	X
	Lara Urizar	619-532-0960	lara.urizar.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Hamide Kayaci	619-532-0930	hamide.kayaci.ctr@navy.mil	
	Chris Yantos	619-532-0952	christopher.yantos.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Simon Loli	619-532-0782	simon.loli.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Laurie Lowman	757-887-7650	laurie.lowman@navy.mil	
	Matt Slack	757-887-4212	matthew.slack@navy.mil	
	Zack Edwards	757-887-4692	zack.edwards@navy.mil	
	Frank Fernandez	510-749-5936	franklin.d.fernandez@navy.mil	
	Jarvis Jensen	757-887-4483	jarvis.jensen@navy.mil	
	Adam Zwiebel	510-749-5947	adam.zwiebel@navy.mil	
	Shane Wells	510-749-5922	robert.s.wells@navy.mil	
	Bob Hunt	619-532-0962	<a href="mailto:robert.a.hunt2.ctr@navy.mil">robert.a.hunt2.ctr@navy.mil</a>	X
	Deb Theroux	619-532-0919	debra.theroux@navy.mil	
USEPA	Craig Cooper	415-947-4148	cooper.craig@epa.gov	X
	Jackie Lane	415-972-3236	Lane.jackie@epa.gov	
DTSC	Ryan Miya	510-540-3775	rmiya@dtsc.gov	X
Water Board	Ross Steenson	510-622-2445	rsteenson@waterboards.ca.gov	
	Tina Low	510-622-5682	tlow@waterboards.ca.gov	
CDPH	Jeff Wong	510-620-3423	jeff.wong@cdph.ca.gov	X
	Tracy Jue	916-324-4808	tracy.jue@cdph.ca.gov	
	Kurt Jackson			
	Larry Morgan			
	Steve Hsu	916-440-7940	steve.hsu@cdph.ca.gov	
CDFG	Charlie Wong			X
City of SF	Amy Brownell	415-252-3967	amy.brownell@sfdph.org	X
Treadwell and Rollo	Sigrida Reinis	415-955-9040	sreinis@treadwellrollo.com	X
Geosyntec	Jeff Austin	415-218-0027	jasustin@geosyntec.com	X
BVHP/Lennar	Steve Rottenborn	408-458-3205	srottenborn@harveyecology.com	

Organization	Name	Phone Number	E-Mail Address	Present
Tech Law Inc., <i>USEPA contractor</i>	Karla Brasaemle	415-762-0566	kbrasaemle@techlawinc.com	X
	Mary Snow			
<i>Navy Contractors</i>				
Tetra Tech EM, Inc.	Tim Mower	313-312-8874	tim.mower@ttemi.com	
Tetra Tech EC, Inc.	Bill Dougherty	415-216-2731	bill.dougherty@tetrattech.com	X
Sealaska Environmental Services	Doug Peeler		doug.peeler@sealaska.com	
CE2	Bruce Rucker	925-400-4586	rucker@ce2corp.com	X
	John Copland	925-463-7301	copland@ce2corp.com	
Kleinfelder	Gary Goodemote	510-628-9000	ggoodemote@kleinfelder.com	
	Gabriel Fuson	510-774-4115	gfuson@kleinfelder.com	X
	Eric Johansen	619-694-5516	ejohansen@kleinfelder.com	
KCH	Leslie Lundgren	415-541-7110	leslie.lundgren@ch2m.com	X
	Jamie Hamm	415-819-4971	Jamie.hamm@ch2m.com	X
ERRG	Doug Bielskis	925-726-4119	doug.bielskis@errg.com	
	John Sourial	415-848-7103	john.sourial@errg.com	
ITSI	Jim Schollard	925-946-3107	jschollard@itsi.com	
	Brett Womack	925-250-8077	bwomack@itsi.com	
	Ken Leonard	925-946-3263	kleonard@itsi.com	
	Jeff Hess	925-946-3104	jhess@itsi.com	
	Arvind Archarya	510-719-6858	aacharya@itsi.com	
	Kent Baugh		kbaugh@itsi.com	
Shaw Group	Wayne Akiyama	925-288-2003	wayne.akiyama@shawgrp.com	
	Ray Schul	415-822-1224	raymond.schul@sahwgrp.com	
	Ulrika Messer	619-241-9451	ulrika.messer@shawgrp.com	X
Battelle	John Hardin	619-574-4827	hardinj@battelle.org	X
AMEC	Alfonso Ang	415-278-2108	Alfonso.ang@amec.com	
	Jeff Fenton	707-793-3832	Jeffery.fenton@amec.com	
	Ray Hendry	303-807-4421		
PNNL	Steve Maheras			
Alliance	Mehrdad Javaherian	415-706-8935	<a href="mailto:mjavaherian@onesullivan.com">mjavaherian@onesullivan.com</a>	X
URS	Jerry Zimmerle	714-433-7738	jerome.zimmerle@urscorp.com	
CirclePoint	Lawrence McGuire	415-227-1100	l.mcguire@circlepoint.com	
	Matt Robinson	510-378-5511	m.robinson@circlepoint.com	X

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>E-Mail Address</b>	<b>Present</b>
CDM	Tamzen Macbeth	208-569-5147	macbethtw@cdm.com	
	Matt Brookshire	858-268-3383	brookshirems@cdm.com	
Arc Ecology	Martha Walters		<a href="mailto:rosewalt@aol.com">rosewalt@aol.com</a>	X
BCDC	Rafael Montes	415-352-3670	rafaelm@bcd.ca.gov	X

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD DOCUMENT TRACKING MATRIX**  
**February 23, 2012**

February 23, 2012

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	Water Board	City of SF
Documents Historically Reviewed									
1	B,D-1, G	Final RCRA for Soil Hot Spot Location B, D-1,G	10/7/11	n/a					
2	B	Draft Final Status Survey Report, Submarine Quay Wall	10/11/11	11/11/11		11/16/11	11/22/11		11/28/11
3	B	Draft Rad RACR	10/21/11	11/21/11		11/16/11	11/22/11		11/28/11
4	C	Final Final Status Survey Results Building 214	11/2/11	n/a					
5	B,D-1,G	Draft Post Construction Summary Report Petroleum Hydrocarbon Corrective Action	11/2/11	12/2/11					12/16/11
6	E-2	Final Landfill Gas Monitoring Report, July-September 2011, Post Removal Action Parcel E-2 Industrial Landfill	11/8/11	n/a					
7	G	Final Survey Unit 204 Project Report, Parcel G Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain Removal Project	11/18/11	n/a					
8	UC-3	Draft Rad RACR	11/18/11	12/19/11		12/21/11	12/19/11		
9	E-2	Draft SAP, Interim Monitoring and Maintenance for Landfill Gas Control Syst.	11/21/11	12/21/11		1/13/12	1/23/12		1/20/2012
10	G	Final Rad RACR	12/2/11	1/6/12	Concurrence	12/14/11	12/9/11		
11	Basewide	Final Execution Plan, Revision 1, Basewide Execution Plan	12/20/11	n/a					
Document Review Period Recently Completed									
1	D-2	Final Radiological Removal Action Completion Report, Revision 2	12/16/11	1/13/12	Concurrence		1/13/2012		

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD DOCUMENT TRACKING MATRIX**  
**February 23, 2012**

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	Water Board	City of SF
2	E	Draft Final Status Survey Results, IR-04 Former Scrap Yard Site and Former Building 807 Site	12/21/11	1/20/12			1/20/12		
3	B	Action, Quarterly Monitoring Report, Second Quarter 2011	12/23/11	1/24/12					
<b>Documents Currently Under Review</b>									
1	E	Draft Final Parcel E FS Radiological Addendum	11/17/11	2/15/12			1/13/12		1/6/2012
2	E-2	Draft Action Memo, TCRA for Ship Shielding	12/29/11	2/13/12		2/1/12			2/12/12
3	C	Draft Final Status Survey Results, Building 272	1/5/12	2/6/12			2/8/12		
4	B	Draft RACR for IR 7 and 18	1/6/12	2/21/12		2/21/12	2/21/12		
5	C	Draft Final Status Survey Results, Building 203	1/6/12	2/6/12			2/8/12		
6	C	Draft Final Status Survey Results, Building 241	1/10/12	2/10/12					
7	Basewide	Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report (April-September 2011)	1/10/12	n/a					
8	E-2	Landfill Gas Monitoring Report for October-December 2011, Post-Removal Action,	1/20/12	n/a					
9	E	Draft Survey Unit 201 Project Report	1/20/12						
10	C	Draft Survey Unit Project Reports for Survey Units 191,193, 195, 196	1/25/12	2/27/12					
11	C	Final RU_C5 GWTS Completion Report	1/27/12	n/a					
12	D-1, D-2, G	Replacement Pages for Final Petroleum Hydrocarbon Site Closeout Report	1/30/12	n/a					

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD DOCUMENT TRACKING MATRIX**  
**February 23, 2012**

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	Water Board	City of SF
13	C	Replacement pages/CD for Final Treatability Study Completion Report, Remedial Unit-C5, Building 134	2/2/12	n/a					
14	Basewide	Final Base-wide Radiological Management Plan	2/3/12	n/a					
15	C	Draft Survey Unit Project Reports for Survey Units 197, 198, 199, and 200	2/7/12	3/9/12					
16	C	Final Pre-Design Investigation Work Plan, RU-C2	2/8/12	n/a					
17	C	Draft Survey Unit Project Reports for Survey Units 202, 203, 205, and 206	2/9/12	3/12/12					
18	E	Final Final Status Survey Results, IR-04 Former Scrap Yard Site and Former Building 807 Site	2/10/12	n/a					
19	C	Final Pre_RA Initial Characterization Work Plan RU-C1, RU-C4, RU-C5	2/15/12	n/a					
<b>Documents for Upcoming Review (next 3 months)</b>									
1	E	Draft Work Plan Addendum to the Parcel E Groundwater Treatability Study	2/22/12	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
2	UC-1,2	Draft Remedial Action Work Plan	3/5/12	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
3	B	Final RACR for IR 7 and 18	3/9/12	n/a	Date Tentative				
4	E-2	Draft Parcel E-2 ROD	3/14/12	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
5	F	Draft Pier Demolition RACR	3/15/12	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
6	E	Draft Parcel E Soil Excavation Characterization Work Plan	3/22/12	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				

**ATTACHMENT B**  
**HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD DOCUMENT TRACKING MATRIX**  
**February 23, 2012**

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	Water Board	City of SF
7	B	Final Rad RACR	3/30/12	concurrence	Date Tentative				
8	E-2	Final Action Memo, TCRA for Ship Shielding	4/2/12	n/a	Date Tentative				
9	B,D-1,G, UC-2	Revised Draft Soil Vapor Investigation Tech Memo	4/13/12	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
10	E-2	Draft TCRA Work Plan for Ship Shielding Area	4/27/12	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
11	UC-1,2	Final Remedial Action Work Plan	5/7/12	n/a	Date Tentative				
12	E	Final Work Plan Addendum to the Parcel E Groundwater Treatability Study	5/9/12	n/a	Date Tentative				
13	F	Draft Radiological Data Gaps Investigation Tech Memo #1	5/15/12	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
14	E	Final Parcel E Soil Excavation Characterization Work Plan	5/25/12	n/a	Date Tentative				
15	F	Final RACR for Pier Demo	6/1/12	n/a	Date Tentative				

**Notes:**

*	Comments deferred to other agency	PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyl
CAP	Corrective Action Plan	ROD	Record of decision
CDPH	California Department of Public Health	RI	Remedial investigation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control	RTC	Response to comment
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	SF	San Francisco
FOSL	Finding of suitability to lease	TCRA	Time critical removal action
FOST	Finding of suitability to transfer	TPH	Total petroleum hydrocarbon
FS	Feasibility study	Water Board	San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
FSS	Final Status Survey		
n/a	Not applicable		

**ATTACHMENT C****HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM ACTION ITEMS**

Item No.	Action Item	Person Authoring the Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
<b>New Action Items</b>					
1	The Navy will schedule a conference call with the regulatory agencies concerning the proposed path forward at RU-C2.	Navy		Navy	
<b>Outstanding Action Items</b>					
1	Describe RAD-impacted designation areas on the landside of Berths in Parcel B.	Navy		Navy	This action item is ongoing. Mr. Forman/Ms. Kito will continue to follow up with Ms. Lowman.